

**REMARKS**

This paper is herewith filed in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on April 24, 2009 for the above-captioned U.S. Patent Application. This office action is a rejection of claims 45-49, 55-57, and 66-74 of the application.

More specifically, the Examiner has rejected claims 46-48, 55-57, 66-69, and 71-74 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US20030036354) in view of Bi (US5,867,106); and rejected claim 45 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Bi and further in view of Liu (US20040176065). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In addition, the Examiner has indicated that claims 49 and 70 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants thank the Examiner for this indication of Allowance.

Claim 55 has been amended to recite in part similar features of allowed claim 49. Claims 67 and 73 have been amended to recite in part features of allowed claim 70. Claims 46-48 and 68-69 have been amended for mere formality. Claims 49 and 70 have been cancelled. Support for the amendments can be found at least in paragraphs [0071] and [0084] - [0086] of the published application. No new matter is added.

Although the Applicants do not expressly or impliedly agree with the rejections in the Office Action, the Applicants note that for at least the reason that independent claim 55 and independent claims 67 and 73 have been amended to recite in part features of the allowed claims 49 and 70, respectively, claims 55, 67, and 73 are seen to be allowable. For at least this reason, the Applicants request that the rejections of claims 55, 67, and 73 be removed and these claims be allowed.

In addition, the Applicants submit that for at least the reason that claims 45-48, 56-57, and

S.N.: 10/821,106  
Art Unit: 2617

66; claims 68-69 and 71-72; and claim 74 depend from independent claims 55, 67, and 73, respectively, these claims are also allowable.

The Applicants respectfully request that, for at least the reasons stated above, the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejections of claims 45-48, 55-57, 66-69, and 71-74 and allow all of the pending claims 45-48, 55-57, 66-69, and 71-74 as now presented for examination.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Should any unresolved issue remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted:



John A. Garrity

8/12/2009  
Date

Reg. No.: 60,470      Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: [jgarrity@hspatent.com](mailto:jgarrity@hspatent.com)

S.N.: 10/821,106  
Art Unit: 2617



### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

8-12-2009  
Date

Clarence F. Main  
Name of Person Making Deposit